



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,632	07/01/2003	Michael Stochosky	2095.004100	3652
62293	7590	11/23/2010		
WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C. 10333 RICHMOND AVE. SUITE 1100 HOUSTON, TX 77042			EXAMINER DENNISON, JERRY B	
			ART UNIT 2443	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/23/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/612,632

Applicant(s)

STOCHOSKY, MICHAEL

Examiner

J Bret Dennison

Art Unit

2443

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to Application Number 10/612,632 received on 31 August 2010.
2. Claims 1-44 are presented for examination.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The specification does not provide proper antecedent basis for a computer program product comprising a computer-readable program storage device as disclosed in claims 33-41.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-21 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
5. Claim 1 includes a system comprising a hardware sender peer component and a hardware recipient peer component, with each comprising modules.
Applicant's specification recites, "In general, a peer is some type of computing device (physical or **virtual**)" [See Applicant's specification, page 8, paragraph 0026].
Microsoft Computer Dictionary defines a virtual device as follows: "A device that can be referenced but that does not physically exist."

Since Applicant's specification provides an embodiment where the claimed devices may be virtual, then the claim includes an embodiment that is entirely made up of software without any physical structure.

As amended, the claim recites that the hardware sender peer and the hardware recipient peer comprise modules. The claim does not recite that the peers store these modules. As such, it appears that the claimed peers are simply made up of the modules and nothing more. As such, it appears the peers, and therefore the claimed "system" still includes a software embodiment. It is recommended that the claim be amended to clearly show that the peers store the modules, thereby clearly showing that the device is made up of physical hardware.

6. Claim 42 includes a "recipient chat module" in a system comprising a processing device including a communications module, a graphical user interface module, and a client module.

Applicant's specification recites, "In general, a peer is some type of computing device (physical or **virtual**)" [See Applicant's specification, page 8, paragraph 0026].

Microsoft Computer Dictionary defines a virtual device as follows: "A device that can be referenced but that does not physically exist."

Since Applicant's specification provides an embodiment where the claimed device may be virtual, then the claim includes an embodiment that is entirely made up of software without any physical structure.

As amended, the claim recites that the hardware processing device includes modules. The claim does not recite that the device stores these modules. As such, it appears that the device is simply made up of the modules and nothing more. As such, it appears the device, and therefore the claimed "recipient chat module" still includes a software embodiment. It is recommended that the claim be amended to clearly show that the hardware processing device stores the modules, thereby clearly showing that the device is made up of physical hardware.

7. Computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs are not physical "things". They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer, which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized.

M.P.E.P. 2601.1 Section I states, "Since a computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program itself is not a process and USPTO personnel should treat a claim for a computer program, without the physical computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality, as nonstatutory functional descriptive material."

8. Claims 1-21 and 42-44 do not provide the physical structure needed to realize the program's functionality. As such, claims 1-21 and 42-44 are not limited to statutory subject matter and are therefore non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 42, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (U.S. 2003/0225834).

9. Regarding claim 42, Lee disclosed a recipient chat module ([0041], "online messenger 24b) in a system for sharing active content between a plurality of peers ([0054], contacts on the list of the messenger service sharing an audio experience), comprising:

a communications module for receiving a one or more unique identifiers based on shared active content on one or more sender peers (Lee, [0078], Lee disclosed the receiving machine making requests for the content using a unique identifier to identify the file and receiving the file over path 30 of Fig. 2) wherein receiving comprises receiving using a communications module communication path (Lee, Fig. 2, path 30);

a graphical user interface module for outputting one or more shared active content and receiving a selection of shared active content associated with one of the one or more sender peers (Lee, Fig. 4, media player 400, for sending and receiving shared audio content);

and a client module for sending a content stream request (Lee, [0078], "request" for data) and receiving an active content stream (Lee, [0075], "dynamic downloading") wherein receiving comprises receiving using a communications module communication path (Lee, Fig. 2, path 30).

10. Regarding claim 44, disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 42, including an application module for activating the received active content stream (Lee, [0042] media player 26b on the receiving end).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 18-24, 27-35, 37-41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (U.S. 2003/0225834) in view of Sollee et al. (US 6757732).

11. Regarding claims 1 and 33, Lee disclosed a system for sharing information about an active content of a sender peer with a recipient peer (Lee, [0008], "shared dynamic content experience between the inviter computer and the invitee computer"), comprising:

a hardware sender peer component (Lee, [0044], "client 20a" is referred to as an inviter client) comprising:

a first application module, for activating and outputting active content from a data file (Lee, [0042], [0050], "media player 26a" for providing "a dynamic content experience" i.e. used to play mp3s);

a first chat module (Lee, [0041], "online messenger 24a"), communicatively coupled to the first application module, the first chat module adapted to send the active content (Lee, [0047], Fig. 4, Messenger Service 300 containing Start Music Play button 304, which starts a shared dynamic session and sharing music) using a chat module communications path (Lee, Fig. 2, 30 is a communications path from the chat module 20a to chat module 20b); and a recipient peer (Lee, [0044], "client 20b" referred to as an invitee client) comprising:

a second chat module component (Lee, [0041], "online messenger 24b"), communicatively coupled to the first chat module using the chat module communications path (Lee, Fig. 2, 30 is a communications path from the chat module 20a to chat module 20b), for receiving and outputting the active content active on the sender peer (Lee, [0055]-[0057], Lee disclosed the online messenger program and media player integrated together to receive and output shared music).

While Lee disclosed the sharing of active content, Lee disclosed such via a second communication path that has higher bandwidth.

Lee did not explicitly state that both the active content and at least one instant message are transmitted across the same communications path.

In an analogous art, Sollee disclosed the a system for text-based communications over a data network in which both text-based chat messages and multimedia data may be transmitted along the same communications path (col. 3, lines 49-57, col. 4, lines 29-36). Therefore Sollee provides evidence that sending both text based chat messages and multimedia data can be sent on one communications path was known in the art.

As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the single communications path of Sollee into the teachings of Lee in order to send both the active content and the text-based chat messages thereby providing the advantage of not having to open up additional ports or setting up additional communications sessions to send desired text or multimedia data

(Sollee, col. 4, lines 32-36). Doing so would yield the predictable result of sending both the chat messages and active content/multimedia messages on a single communication.

Claim 33 includes a computer program product containing a computer-readable medium that includes limitations that are substantially similar to the limitations of claim 1. Lee disclosed a computer readable medium (Lee, [0028]) performing the functionality of the claim. The pre-established path in Lee is the path 30 from client 20a to client 20b in Figure 2. Therefore claim 33 is rejected under the same rationale.

12. Regarding claim 2, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the second chat module further comprises a client module for requesting a stream of the active content and the first chat module further comprises a server module for sending the stream of active content in response to the request (Lee, [0075]; "dynamic download" i.e. streaming, [0078], "request" action can be sent before content is sent for a given file).

13. Regarding claim 3, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 2, including wherein the recipient peer further comprises a second application module for automatically activating the active content stream (Lee, [0075], media player can begin playing the dynamic media before it is completely downloaded, with the media player determining when to start playing the stream).

14. Regarding claim 4, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 3, including wherein the stream is substantially synchronized with a portion of the active content currently active to the first application module (Lee, [0072]).

15. Regarding claim 5, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 4, including wherein the second application module allows active content playback control independent from the synchronized stream (Lee, [0073], Lee disclosed allowing the invitee to skip, pause or stop playback of the stream).

16. Regarding claim 6, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the active content information comprises a unique identifier (Lee, [0078], "unique identifier for the file").

17. Regarding claim 7, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 6, wherein the recipient peer further comprises a content database (Lee, [0079], virtual memory, cache, that stores tracks). Lee also disclosed the recipient machine using a unique identifier to identify files (Lee, [0078]) and the sending machine "knows" which tracks are currently stored on the receiving machine (Lee, [0079]).

Lee and Sollee did not explicitly state wherein the second chat module is configured to use the unique identifier to retrieve local active content from the content database.

However, since the sending machine “knows” what tracks the receiving machine has stored and “knows” that it does not need to send these tracks, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention that the receiving machine retrieves the tracks that it has stored in memory, using the unique identifier as used to identify the file, for the benefit of limiting or minimizing the amount of traffic between machines (Lee, [0079]).

18. Regarding claim 8, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 6, including wherein the recipient peer uses the unique identifier to retrieve active content information from an active content enhancement server ([0050], Lee disclosed that “the audio files can be stored remotely from the inviter computer, and retrieved when the user selects them to be played”; [0078], Lee disclosed requesting the files using a unique identifier).

19. Regarding claim 18, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the active content comprises a title and a type of the active content (Lee, [0077]).

20. Regarding claim 19, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the first chat module is an instant messaging application (Lee, [0045]).

21. Regarding claim 20, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein a display of the first chat module is integrated within a display of the first application module (Lee, Fig. 4, 300, 400).

22. Regarding claim 21, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the first chat module sends updated active content information to reflect a change of active content (Lee, [0072], [0097], Lee disclosed the sending machine may update the playlist, which causes a change in the content shared by the users).

23. Regarding claim 22, Lee disclosed a method for sharing active content of a first peer with a second peer, comprising:

activating media content from a data file at a sender peer (Lee, [0042], [0050], "media player 26a" for providing "a dynamic content experience" i.e. used to play mp3s);

sending real time active media content from the sender peer to a recipient peer through a chat network connection responsive to detecting active media content on the sender peer (Lee, [0097], Lee disclosed when the sender updates the playlist by

changing or adding songs, the receiver playlist gets updated as well; [0047], Fig. 4, Lee disclosed the Messenger Service 300 integrated with media player 400); and

receiving and outputting the active media content at the recipient peer (Lee, [0097], Lee disclosed when the sender updates the playlist by changing or adding songs, the receiver playlist gets updated as well; [0047]).

While Lee disclosed the sharing of active content, Lee disclosed such via a second communication path that has higher bandwidth.

Lee did not explicitly state that both the active content and at least one instant message are transmitted across the same communications path.

In an analogous art, Sollee disclosed the a system for text-based communications over a data network in which both text-based chat messages and multimedia data may be transmitted along the same communications path (col. 3, lines 49-57, col. 4, lines 29-36). Therefore Sollee provides evidence that sending both text based chat messages and multimedia data can be sent on one communications path was known in the art.

As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the single communications path of Sollee into to teachings of Lee in order to send both the active content and the text-based chat messages thereby providing the advantage of not having to open up additional ports or setting up additional communications sessions to send desired text or multimedia data (Sollee, col. 4, lines 32-36). Doing so would yield the predictable result of sending both

the chat messages and active content/multimedia messages on a single communication.

24. Regarding claim 23, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 22, including streaming the active media content from the sender peer to the recipient peer (Lee, [0075], "dynamic downloading").

25. Regarding claim 24, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 23, including activating the active media content stream substantially in real time with the activated media content at the recipient peer (Lee, [0075], media player can begin playing the dynamic media before it is completely downloaded, with the media player determining when to start playing the stream).

26. Regarding claim 27, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 22, including sending transaction information related to the active media content to the recipient peer responsive to the recipient peer receiving active media content (Lee, [0062], Lee disclosed sending a user a subscription user interface if the capability requires a paid subscription);

and processing a transaction related to the transaction information (Lee, [0062], Lee disclosed enabling the user if paid).

27. Regarding claim 28, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 27, including wherein the transaction is a purchase of the active media content (Lee, [0063], using the content sharing service is a paid subscription service).

28. Regarding claim 29, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 22, including wherein the activating comprises a first media player activating media content (Lee, [0052]), and the receiving comprises a chat module receiving active media content (Lee, Fig. 7, 700 and 750).

29. Regarding claim 30, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 22, including wherein the active media content is an audio file (Lee, [0050], sharing mp3).

30. Regarding claim 31, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 22, including wherein the active media content comprises a title and a type of the active media content (Lee, [0077]-[0078]).

31. Regarding claim 32, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 22, including updating active media content at the recipient peer responsive to a change of active media content at the sender peer (Lee,

[0072], [0097], Lee disclosed the sending machine may update the playlist, which causes a change in the content shared by the users).

32. Regarding claim 34, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 33, including instructions and data for: streaming the active content through the peer-to-peer network to the recipient peer (Lee, [0075]).

33. Regarding claim 35, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 34, including instructions and data for: activating the active content stream at the sender peer (Lee, [0076]-[0078], pushing the data to the recipient).

34. Regarding claim 37, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 33, including sending transaction information related to the active media content to the recipient peer responsive to the recipient peer receiving active media content (Lee, [0062], Lee disclosed sending a user a subscription user interface if the capability requires a paid subscription);

and processing a transaction related to the transaction information (Lee, [0062], Lee disclosed enabling the user if paid).

35. Regarding claim 38, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 37, including wherein the transaction is a purchase of the

active media content (Lee, [0063], using the content sharing service is a paid subscription service).

36. Regarding claim 39, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 33, including wherein the activating comprises a first media player activating media content (Lee, [0052]), and the receiving comprises a chat module receiving active media content (Lee, Fig. 7, 700 and 750).

37. Regarding claim 40, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 22, including wherein the active content comprises an active media content (Lee, [0050], mp3).

38. Regarding claim 41, Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 33, including updating active media content at the recipient peer responsive to a change of active media content at the sender peer (Lee, [0072], [0097], Lee disclosed the sending machine may update the playlist, which causes a change in the content shared by the users).

39. Claims 9-11, 13-17, 25-26, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Sollee in view of Elgen (U.S. 7,080,030).

40. Regarding claims 9, 25, 36 Lee and Sollee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1, 22, and 33. Lee also disclosed the sharing experience can be implemented as a paid subscription service in which a subscription user interface would be provided to the client (Lee, [0062]). Lee also disclosed that the audio files can be stored remotely from the clients (Lee, [0050]).

Lee and Sollee did not explicitly state further comprising an active content enhancement server, communicatively coupled to the second chat module, for providing supplements related to the active content by query.

However, since Lee suggested storing files remotely from the clients, as well as integrating a paid subscription service, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a remote server for providing these features.

In an analogous art of providing multimedia, Elgen disclosed a database server the includes a music database that stores information about content stored on the file servers of the system (Elgen, Fig. 2, database server 208, music database 225; col. 9, lines 24-25; col. 10, lines 9-16). Elgen provides users with access to this music database by request of a web page (Elgen, col. 10, lines 45-50), and the system generates a webpage that provides the requested information from the particular database (Elgen, col. 10, lines 55-65). Elgen disclosed that each item in the database contains a unique identifier, "media ID" field (Elgen, col. 11, lines 20-21) within a media information table (Elgen, col. 11, lines 4-15).

Lee suggests the use of a remote system to provide features such as audio file storage. Elgen provides such a system that not only stores the audio content in its file servers, but also provides supplemental information about each file (Elgen, col. 10, lines 10-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Elgen into the system of Lee and Sollee to enable users to find out information about music that a friend would like to share with them before starting the shared session, thereby allowing them to determine whether or not they would be interested in such music.

41. Regarding claim 10, Lee Sollee and Elgen disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 9, including wherein the content enhancement server further comprises a content transaction module for processing a purchase related to one or more sources containing the active content (Elgen, Figs. 12A and 12B, Elgen disclosed allowing clients to purchase music). See motivation above.

42. Regarding claim 11, Lee Sollee and Elgen disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 9, including wherein the active content enhancement server further comprises a content supplement database containing supplemental information related the active content (Elgen, col. 10, lines 9-16, music database). See motivation above.

43. Regarding claim 13, Lee Sollee and Elgen disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 9, including wherein the sender peer and the recipient peer are communicatively coupled through a first network (Lee, Fig. 2, network 70), and the recipient peer and the content enhancement server are communicatively coupled through a second network (Lee, Fig. 2, network 60). See motivation above.

44. Regarding claim 14, Lee Sollee and Elgen disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 9, including wherein the sender peer further comprises a content repository for storing content activated by the first application module (Lee, [0050], audio files stores on inviter computer). See Motivation above.

45. Regarding claim 15, Lee Sollee and Elgen disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 9, including wherein the first application module comprises a first media player (Lee, [0042], "media player 20a), the second application module comprises a second media player (Lee, [0042], "media player 20b), and a file format of the active content is compatible with the second application module (Lee, [0050], content sharing mode supports well-known .mp3 and .wma formats). See Motivation above.

46. Regarding claim 16, Lee Sollee and Elgen disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 15, including, wherein the active content comprises an

active media (Lee, [0050], shared content includes well-known .mp3 and .wma formats).
See Motivation above. See Motivation above.

47. Regarding claim 17, Lee Sollee and Elgen disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 16, including wherein the active media comprises one from the group consisting of an audio file and a video file (Lee, [0050], shared content includes well-known .mp3 and .wma formats). See Motivation above.

48. Regarding claim 26, Lee Sollee and Elgen disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 25, including wherein the supplemental information includes graphic files related to the active media (Elgen, col. 10, lines 10-15, "album picture"). See motivation above.

Claims 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al (U.S. 2003/0225834) in view of Wiser et al. (U.S. 6,385,596).

49. Regarding claim 43, disclosed Lee disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 42, including wherein the content stream request comprises the unique identifier ([0078] "unique identifier for the file"). Lee also disclosed the sharing experience can be implemented as a paid subscription service in which a subscription user interface would be provided to the client (Lee, [0062]). Lee also disclosed that the audio files can be stored remotely from the clients (Lee, [0050]).

Lee did not explicitly state wherein the recipient chat module sends the content stream request to a content enhancement server containing previews of the associated active content.

However, since Lee suggested storing files remotely from the clients, as well as integrating a paid subscription service, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a remote server for providing these features.

In an analogous art of online music distribution, Wiser disclosed a music distribution system (Wiser, col. 3, lines 10-15) that provides users with un-encrypted versions of a song that may be a portion of the song in which the consumer can preview the song before purchasing (Wiser, col. 3, lines 55-62).

Lee suggests the use of a remote system to provide features such as audio file storage. Wiser provides such a system that not only stores the audio content, but also provides supplemental information about each song including a free preview of the song (Wiser, col. 3, lines 55-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Wiser into the system of Lee to enable users to find out information as well as listen to a preview of the music that a friend would like to share with them before starting the shared session, thereby allowing them to determine whether or not they would be interested in such music before initiating the shared session.

50. Claims 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Sollee in view of Elgen and further in view of Wiser et al. (U.S. 6,385,596).

51. Regarding claim 12, Lee Sollee and Elgen disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 9. Elgen also disclosed wherein users can request information about music files and if interested, be able to purchase them through the system's webpage (Elgen, col. 10, lines 10-15, 45-50, 56-65; Fig. 24A, 24B), as well as storing each item with a unique identifier (Elgen, col. 11, lines 20-21). See motivation to combine above.

Lee Sollee and Elgen did not explicitly state a content repository containing previews related to the one or more sources containing the active content, and the active supplement database streams an active content preview to the recipient peer.

In an analogous art of online music distribution, Wiser disclosed a music distribution system (Wiser, col. 3, lines 10-15) that provides users with un-encrypted versions of a song that may be a portion of the song in which the consumer can preview the song before purchasing (Wiser, col. 3, lines 55-62).

Both Elgen and Wiser provide online music distribution systems that provide the user with information about items to help them make a decision as to whether to purchase the item. Wiser not only provides the information that Elgen provides (Wiser, col. 3, lines 61-63), but also takes this one step further as to actually allowing the user to preview the song (Wiser, col. 3, lines 55-63).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the previewing feature of Wiser into the distribution system of Lee Sollee and Elgen to provide the extra feature of letting the consumer listen to a song to help the consumer decide whether or not to purchase the high fidelity version

Response to Arguments

52. Applicant's arguments filed 3/31/2008 have been considered but they are not fully persuasive.

Objection to the Specification

The objection to the Specification for lack of antecedent basis is maintained because while Applicant attempts to point out possible examples in Applicant's Specification, it is indeterminable exactly how a "computer readable program storage device" is defined. The Specification does not provide the proper antecedent basis for this terminology. It is recommended that the Specification be amended to recite the claimed "computer readable program storage device" with reference to the intended examples already presented in the specification. Doing so does not add new matter, but rather just categorizes the examples that are already disclosed in the specification.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 101

Applicant's arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 101 Rejections are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, the amendments recite a "hardware sender peer component". Examiner was unable to locate a specific definition for the "component" as claimed.

Furthermore, the claim recites that the claimed "components" comprise modules and nothing more. As such, the Examiner interprets the claimed components as including embodiments made up of only modules as claimed and therefore the claimed system still covers software embodiments. In order to correct this deficiency, it is recommended that the claim be amended to clearly show that the hardware sender peer component and the hardware recipient peer component store the modules rather than just comprise the modules, thereby distinguishing from the embodiment where the components are made up of modules.

The same applies to the claimed "hardware processing device" of claim 33, as the device merely includes modules, all of which may be software. Since the device merely includes modules, and nothing more, then the claimed "recipient chat module" still includes an embodiment made up of entirely software. It is recommended that the claim be amended to clarify that the device stores the modules in order to distinguish from the embodiment where the device is made up of the modules.

To help Applicant in understanding Examiner's interpretation of the claims, Examiner reminds Applicant that limitations of the specification cannot be read into the claims. The claims as presented recite that the device/components include/comprise modules and nothing more. While it can be assumed that the device/components may include other elements, these elements are not claimed.

Art Rejections

Applicant argues that because Sollee disclosed that a chat session may be implemented over a high bandwidth call session, that Sollee did not disclose that active

content and at least one chat message are sent using a chat module communications path [Response, 14].

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Since Sollee disclosed sending active content on the same path that is used for chat messages, then Sollee disclosed sending active content (as well as chat messages) over a chat module communications path as claimed. The argument regarding which path is low or high bandwidth has no relevancy as such is not claimed.

The Applicant argues that the Examiner has not provided sufficient motivation to combine or modify the cited references. The Examiner notes that evidence of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine prior art references may flow, inter alia, from the references themselves, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or from the nature of the problem to be solved. See *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 1000, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999). In this case, both references are directed to the transmission of chat messages and other types of content. It is *prima facie* obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose, the idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art. See MPEP 2144.06 and *In re Kerkhoven*, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980). In the instant case, Lee disclosed sending both chat and active content via two separate paths. Sollee disclosed that sending both on one path is well known. As such it would have been obvious to modify Lee to send both on the same path as shown by Sollee. Examiner also notes that since Lee already

disclosed this high bandwidth path that Applicant points out [Response, p15, last paragraph], the simple substitution of Sollee's sending of both types of data over the same path would not require any extra implementation as the path is already available and since Sollee already showed that sending both on the same path is well known.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22, 33 are not persuasive. Applicant argues with respect to Lee. However the rejection is based on the combination of Lee and Sollee.

Applicant argues that Lee fails to disclose the claims GUI of claim 42. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 42 does not even mention a GUI. Even if it did, the Lee reference clearly disclosed such a GUI as shown in the Figures.

Applicant argues that the request for the stream is not like the request as claimed because the request of Lee is played at some later time. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in the mapping, the recipient can request the stream. Lee further disclosed that the playback for all involved is a dynamic content experience in which

everything is synchronized. As Lee further disclosed that the content can be played back while being downloaded as shown in [0075] and the fact that the shared experience is synchronized, such would include streaming as Applicant argues.

As such, the combination of Lee and Sollee disclosed the invention as claimed.

It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in manner, which distinguishes over the prior art.

Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterates the need for the Applicant to more clearly and distinctly define the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part

of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (571) 272-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J Bret Dennison/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure

relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (571) 272-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2443

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J Bret Dennison/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443